

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,880	08/04/2003	Philip G. Wessells	20003-7012	5236
35939	7590 09/30/2005		EXAMINER	
MICHAEL E. WOODS PATENT LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL E. WOODS			HECKENBERG JR, DONALD H	
112 BARN R		EB E. WOODS	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TIBURON,	CA 94920-2602		1722	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		29	7			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/633,880	WESSELLS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Donald Heckenberg	1722				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION AND THE COMMUNICAT	DN. timely filed on the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 J	une 2005.					
. · · 	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, p	rosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under I	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		·				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12,14-18 and 23-37</u> is/are pending	in the application.		:			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-16 and 37</u> is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 1-12,17,18 and 23-36 is/are rejected.	,					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers		·				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	•				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correc	tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority document						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ority documents have been recei	ved in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not recei	ved.				
	•					
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summa	ry (PTO-413)				
2) DNotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail	Date				
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date —. 	6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)



- 1. A request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR
 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed
 in this application after final rejection. Since this
 application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR
 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely
 paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been
 withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission
 filed on 25 June 2005 has been entered.
- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-12, 17, 18, and 23-36 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-12, 17, 18, 23, 24, 35, and 36 have been amended to recite that forming elements of the apparatus (the scoop and

former) are "butted-hingedly" coupled together. Claims 25-34 have been amended to recite the similarly in reciting that that second forming element is "butted-moveably" coupled to the shaft.

Applicant notes in the remarks of 09 May 2005, that the term includes the idea that the element does not have a handle or actuator arm extending past the hinge/moving element as is the case as the element "butts" into the hinge/moving element. In the remarks of 25 June 2005 Applicant similarly notes that "butted-hingedly" is used in the sense of a butt-joint or butt hinge, with an example being a hinge composed of two plates attached to abutting surfaces of a door and door jamb and joined by a pin.

The specification of the instant application does not use the term "butted-hingedly." Nor is there any description similar to that assert by Applicant in the remarks with respect to the term.

The drawings of the application are not clear enough to provide support the former butted-hingedly coupled to the scoop. The drawings provided in the file wrapper show darkly shaded figures which do not convey the details of the area of coupling between the former and scoop. The areas do not reveal whether or not an element in any way extends past the coupling, as Applicant suggests the term is intended to mean.

Thus, as neither the specification, nor the drawings of the originally-filed application describe or show the butted-hingedly relationship between the former and scoop, or similarly, a "butted-moveably" relation between the second forming element and the shaft, the reciting of such relationships present new matter.

Note as well that the term "butted-hingedly" as defined by Applicant includes a negative limitation; that is, the preclusion of an handle or actuator extending past the hinge/moving element. Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have a basis in the originally filed disclosure. The mere absence of a positive recitation is not basis for an exclusion. MPEP § 2173.05(i). The disclosure of the instant application does not describe the lack of a handle, actuator, or other member extending past the hinge/moving element.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-6, 8, 12, 17, 25-28, 30, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maxwell (U.S. Pat. No. 2,629,344; previously of record).

Maxwell discloses a material forming apparatus. In the embodiment depicted in Figure 3, the apparatus comprises a shaft (22) having a gripping end and a shaping end remote from the gripping end. A shaper (70) is disposed at the distal end, with the shaper including a pair of opposing forming elements (72 and 74) attached to the distal end for relative pivotal motion between them, with the forming elements each including a cavity for shaping a particular material (see Fig. 3). In moving between the open positions and closed positions shown in Fig. 3, the forming elements go through a relative pivotal motion between them of about 180 degrees (about 90 degrees for each section 72 and 74).

Claims of the instant application recite an intended use for the apparatus. Specifically, the apparatus is to be used for collecting and compressing a compressible medium, with the compressible medium more specifically being defined as snow. It is well settled the intended use of an apparatus is not germane to the issue of the patentability of apparatus claims. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the claimed use, then it meets the claim limitation(s). In re Casey, 370 F.2d

576, 580, 152 USPQ 235, 238 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP § 2115. In the instant case Maxwell discloses all of the structural features of the claimed apparatus, and is therefore clearly capable of being used with a compressible material such as snow. Maxwell therefore anticipates the claimed use limitation of the claims.

6. Claims 1-7, 9, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blevins et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,509,273; previously of record).

Blevins discloses a snowball forming and ejecting device. The device comprises a shaft (34) having a gripping end (towards element 40) and a distal end, with a scoop (42) coupled to the distal end of the shaft for collecting a bolus of a snow. A scoop (42) including a first cavity is coupled to the distal end of the shaft at an attachment location (see Fig. 2). A former (12) including a second cavity is coupled and mating with the scoop for molding and compressing the snow into a spherical ball retained within the scoop (see Fig. 2 and cl. 2, 11. 34-50). The former is coupled to the scoop "proximate" to the attachment location of the scoop shaft (see Fig. 2 showing the coupling of the scoop and former close or very near the attachment location as compared to the other apparatus elements or structures). The

device is as such to have a closed position relative to the scoop when the snow is molded in the ball when the scoop and former juxtapose to form a spherical shell (shown in fig. 2), as well as have an open position for releasing the snowball (shown in Fig. 3). Blevins further discloses the apparatus to comprise a latching mechanism (24) for inhibiting the former from moving to an opening position.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 25 June 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the term "proximate" in describing the relationship of elements of the apparatus (e.g. the scoop relative to the attachment location in claim 1) patentably distinguishes the claims over the prior art of record.

As noted in the previous Office Actions, the term "proximate" must be give its broadest reasonable interpretation. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary provides as one definition of proximate as "very near" or "close" (see cited document). The dictionary further notes definitions for the synonyms "proximal" as "close," and "proximity" as "the quality or state of being proximate closeness." Thus, a reasonable interpretation of the term "proximate" is that it conveys the idea of elements being in a near or close relation.

The prior art used in the rejections describes elements falling within this scope of the term "proximate." Maxwell for example, shows that former and scoop combination (forming elements 72 and 74) very near or close to an attachment location with the shaft (see Fig. 3). Blevins also discloses a close relationship to between the scoop attachment location and the coupling of the former, see for example Fig. 2 showing the proximity of these elements in comparison to the other elements of the apparatus.

It is noted Applicant's argument with respect to the term "proximate" as used in the claims relative to the disclosure of the prior art amounts to a judgment of amount and degree. A general assertion that two elements in the prior art are not "proximate" without providing more of a definitive distinction or definition when the prior art shows the elements to be in a reasonable proximity cannot be used to show patentability over the prior art.

8. Claims 14-16 and 37 are allowed. See the reasons for indicating allowable subject matter in the previous Office Actions.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald Heckenberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-1131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

Donald Heckenberg

Primary Examiner

A.U. 1722